

REMARKS

The Office Action of July 20, 2007, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over the patent to Crenella, et al.

Claims 14-21 and 23-26 are rejected as being unpatentable over Crenella, et al. in view of the patent to Fortescue.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, and particularly to the patent to Crenella, et al., it can be seen that this patent discloses a two-part wireless communication system for elevator hallway fixtures. The presently claimed invention is a remote status reading system having a central controller and peripheral devices linked by a communication network. The status of the peripheral devices is periodically scanned and read out by the central controller through the communication network. The communication network links the central controller and the peripheral devices by radio frequency and also supplies electrical energy to the peripheral devices via the radio frequency. There

is no disclosure by Crenella, et al. of a configuration in which the peripheral devices are provided with power via radio frequency from the communication network, as in the presently claimed invention. Furthermore, Crenella, et al. do not disclose a controller operative to periodically scan the peripheral devices to read their instantaneous statuses, as recited in the presently claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that Crenella, et al. do not disclose the present invention.

In view these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 13 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Fortescue discloses a combined wireless sending and receiving system. The Examiner combined this reference with Crenella, et al. in determining that claims 14-21 and 23-26 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant submits that Fortescue does not teach a system configured so that radio frequency from a communication network supplies electrical energy to peripheral devices, as in the presently claimed invention. Furthermore, Fortescue does not teach a controller operative to periodically scan the peripheral devices to read their instantaneous statuses. Thus, since neither of the references teach these features, a combination of the two references also does not teach powering the peripheral devices via radio frequency from the communication network and a controller that is operative to periodically scan the peripheral devices, as in the presently claimed invention.

Appl. No.: 10/517,797
Amdt. Dated October 22, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2007


In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 14-21 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Amendment, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on October 22, 2007

Klaus P. Stoffel


Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative


Signature

October 22, 2007

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Klaus P. Stoffel

Registration No.: 31,668

WOLFF & SAMSON PC

One Boland Drive

West Orange, New Jersey 07052

Telephone: (973) 530-2086

KPS/mj